IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

MONDAY, THE 17TH DECEMBER 2007 / 26TH AGRAHAYANA 1929

W.P(C).No. 37288 of 2007(L)

PETITIONER:

DR. HEMLET, AGED 37,
S/O ALFRED, SOMA VILASAM, VELLIMON,
KUNDARA, KOLLAM.

BY ADV. SRI.R.T.PRADEEP
SRI.V.VIJULAL

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. **STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY CHIEF SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

2. **THE TAHSILDAR, TALUK OFFICE, KOLLAM.**

3. **THE VILLAGE OFFICER, PERINAD VILLAGE OFFICE, PERINAD.**

4. **THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, OFFICE OF KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

BY GOVT. PLEADER, SRI. BENJAMIN PAUL
ADV. SRI. ALEXANDER THOMAS, SC FOR PSC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 17/12/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

ANTONY DOMINIC, J.

= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =

W.P. (C) No. 37288 OF 2007 - L

= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =

Dated this the 17th December, 2007

J U D G M E N T

Ext. P10 order is under challenge. By Ext. P10, the request made by the petitioner is for a certificate to the effect that he belongs to Christian Parava community, non-creamy layer has been rejected. Ext. P10 shows that the church certificate was to the effect that the petitioner was following the Latin Catholic rites. Referring to the documents that were available, the Village Officer had also reported that the previous certificate that he had issued was also erroneous. The Tahsildar in Ext. P10 has also recorded that during the course of the enquiry though the petitioner had appeared before him, he could not produce any documents to prove that he belongs to Latin Catholic Parava community. Further, the petitioner also could not substantiate his contention that his forefathers had converted from Hindu Parava into Christianity. It is in these circumstances, the 2nd respondent has passed Ext. P10

declining the petitioner's request to issue Christian Parava community certificate and also with the endorsement that he belongs to non-creamy layer. In view of these factual findings and the judgment of this Court in Rajan v. State of Kreala [2007 (3) KLT 730], I do not see any justification to interfere with Ext. P10 order passed by the 2nd respondent.

Writ petition fails and is dismissed.

ANTONY DOMINIC
JUDGE

jan/-